



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,646	03/10/2004	Mathew Hayden Harper	111244.162 (US1)	4189
23483 7590 03/26/2008 WILMERHALE/BOSTON 60 STATE STREET BOSTON, MA 02109				
EXAMINER RUBIN, BLAKE J				
ART UNIT 4152		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/26/2008		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

michael.mathewson@wilmerhale.com  
teresa.carvalho@wilmerhale.com  
sharon.mathews@wilmerhale.com

## Interview Summary

**Application No.**

10/797,646

**Applicant(s)**

HARPER ET AL.

**Examiner**

BLAKE RUBIN

**Art Unit**

4152

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) BLAKE RUBIN.(3) Benjamin Brown.(2) Vincent Boccio.

(4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 19 March 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Perras et al (U.S. Patent 6,904,033).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: With respect to claim 1, applicant's representative stated that an amendment would be made to the claim in response to feedback provided by Primary Examiner Boccio. With respect to claim 15, applicants representative disputed the examiners interpretation of the timing of "a configuration request signal" with respect to other configuration request signals.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/ Blake Rubin /

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required